

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 28, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully noted. The pending claims, claims 1-3, were rejected and claim 4 was withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration, without amendment to the claims, respectfully is requested in view of the following remarks.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima (US 5,384,632). The Examiner also rejected claim 2 as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Brown (US 20040095587). The Examiner rejected claim 3 as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Brown and further in view of PowerPoint.

Applicants respectfully urge that Nakajima, alone or in combination with Brown and PowerPoint, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Nakajima, Brown and PowerPoint fail to teach or suggest determining a layout in a writing space mode, based on a top side position and a direction of a document.

Nakajima alone does not teach or suggest a writing space mode settable by an operator. Nakajima does not teach or suggest a document top side setting section for an operator to designate a position of a top side of a document. Nakajima does not teach or suggest a document direction judging section that determines a direction of the document. Thus, Nakajima fails to teach or suggest a layout determination section that determines a layout of the document image and writing space on a paper sheet, based on the document's top side position and direction.

Applicants respectfully urge that the "2-in-1 mode" description at column 1, lines 83-63, of Nakajima is not analogous, as asserted by the Examiner, to "a writing space mode" of the present invention as claimed. Specifically, Nakajima discloses that both a notice of holding a conference and its agenda are recorded on a sheet of paper by using a 2-in-1 mode for some copies, while the notice is recorded only on one half of a sheet for the other copies, by not using the 2-in-1 mode. This is so that the other half is used for taking notes. Nakajima's disclosure is not the same as Applicants' "a writing space mode" that is set by an operator.

In addition, Applicants respectfully urge that the paper size feature of Figure 3 of Nakajima does not correspond, as asserted by the Examiner, to their "a document top side setting

section” and “a document directing judging section” as claimed. In fact, Figure 3 and the related description of Nakajima have nothing to do with setting the position of the top side and direction of a “document” to be reproduced. Instead, the disclosure of Nakajima relates to setting a copy “paper” or recording sheet on which the image of a document is to be recorded. Nakajima only mentions selection for paper size and direction; however, Nakajima does not disclose anything about setting a top side position of a document or judging the direction of the document.

Since the disclosure of Nakajima relates to setting copy paper or recording sheets, Nakajima fails to teach or suggest determining a layout in the writing space mode, based on a document top side position and direction. Applicants submit that even if the information about paper size and paper direction were available, it would not be possible to determine a suitable layout in a writing space mode without information about the top side position and the direction of the document. Thus, Nakajima does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully urge that Brown and PowerPoint do not alleviate the deficiencies of Nakajima. Nowhere do Brown or PowerPoint teach or suggest determining a layout in a writing space mode based on a top side position and a direction of a document. Thus, the combined disclosures of Nakajima, Brown and PowerPoint do not result in the claimed invention as a whole, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 032739 M 085.

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch  
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: June 27, 2008

1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1130  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 263-4300  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

MAM/SKS/lmq